



RECEIVED
SEP 05 2002
GROUP 3600

Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 033192-007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)
Terutsugu GOTANDA et al.) Group Art Unit: 3612
Application No.: 09/988,648) Examiner: K. Patel
Filed: November 20, 2001) Confirmation No.: 8855
For: SHOCK ABSORBING MEMBER)
AND BUMPER)

Election
H. Jones
9/10/02

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT
AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D. C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Official Action dated August 2, 2002, the following remarks are submitted.

The aforementioned Official Action indicates that the claims in this application are directed to two different inventions. As identified in the Official Action, the two inventions are as follows.

Group I invention recited in Claims 1, 7 and 8 directed to a hollow shock absorber.

Group II invention set forth in Claims 2-6 directed to a vehicle bumper.

Based on the observation that the two inventions are distinct from one another, a restriction requirement has been imposed requiring an election of one of the two inventions.

Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, the Group II invention recited in Claims 2-6.

The Official Action also indicates that the claims in this application are directed to four different species. As identified in the Official Action, the four species are as follows.

Species A illustrated in Figs. 1-4.

Species B shown in Fig. 5.

Species C depicted in Fig. 6.

Species D illustrated in Fig. 7.

Based on the observation that the four species are patentably distinct from one another, an election of species requirement has been imposed requiring an election of one of the four species.

In response to the election of species requirement, applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Species A illustrated in Figs. 1-4. Claims 2-6 are generic to all four species of the invention and are readable on the elected species shown in Figs. 1-4.

The election of the Group I invention is made with traverse because it is believed that all of the claims of this application can be examined at the same time without serious burden. While it is recognized that the two inventions may be separately classified, it is believed that the search required for the elected invention set forth in Claims 2-6 would likely extend into those areas where the non-elected invention would be searched. In

addition, examining the claims directed to the non-elected invention in addition to those directed to the elected invention would only involve consideration of a few additional claims.

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the restriction requirement and the election of species requirement, and examination of all of the claims of this application, including Claims 2-6 directed to the elected invention and the elected species, are respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, the undersigned kindly asks that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Matthew L. Schneider
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32,814

P. O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
Phone: (703) 836-6620

Date: September 3, 2002